DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 859 JC 790 134

AUTHOR Field, Betty, Comp.; And Others
TITLE Charette: Planning and Educational Priorities. A Summary Report.
INSTITUTION Maricopa County Community Coll. District, Phoenix, Ariz.
PUB DATE 29 Nov 78
NOTE 39p.; The 1978 Report to the Governing Board of Maricopa Community Colleges by the Joint Council on Educational Priorities is appended to the document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Board of Education Policy; College Administration; College Role; Community Colleges; Conference Reports; Decision Making; Developmental Programs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; General Education; *Junior Colleges; *Regional Planning; Student Personnel Services; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Arizona (Maricopa County)

ABSTRACT

An outline of the proceedings of a conference to plan the educational priorities of the Maricopa County (Arizona) Community College District and the subsequent report to the governing board are presented. Task force groups focused on the role of Maricopa Technical Community College in the district; the role of the district in statewide postsecondary education; occupational education from the institutional point of view; the student's perspective on occupational education; the role of general education and transfer education; efforts and problems in developmental education; the role of student services; and use of potential and available fiscal resources. Policy statements express the need for decision-making, budgetary commitments, and timetables for implementing plans in areas of: (1) student retention; (2) attracting new clientele; (3) ongoing assessment and identification of the client groups to be served; (4) improving delivery systems; (5) program of community involvement; (6) delineation of functions and responsibilities of the board, administration, faculty, and staff; (7) increased resource for staff development; (8) funding new concepts; (9) developing a process of evaluation; (10) improved communications; and (11) providing better service. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165859

THE MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

C H A R E T T E

Planning and Educational Priorities

(A Summary Report)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alfredo G. de los Santos, jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Compiled and Revised by:

Betty Field
Dave Bydalek
Anne Cowan
John Messer
Jean Tease
Ralph Norton
John Cordova
Mide Svaco

November 29, 1978

JC 790 134

INTRODUCTION

DATES: November 16 and 17, 1978

LOCATION: Ramada Inn - East
Phoenix, Arizona

CHARRETTE: The Charrette was an intensive working conference with the 70 participants divided into small groups called "Task Forces". The groups reviewed, critiqued, and formulated recommendations on the educational planning problems presented. These groups worked under the direction of a "Task Force Leader" and consultants were available to assist the groups in their deliberations. A three-member jury and the Charrette participants evaluated the presentations made by the groups.

PURPOSE: To review the educational planning in the Maricopa County Community College District and the recommendations of the Joint Council on Educational Priorities.

FIRST SESSION

Thursday, November 16, 1978

7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

The Charrette opened with an introduction by Dr. Paul Elsner, Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community College District. After welcoming the group and introducing the participants, Dr. Elsner gave an overview and his perception of the educational planning process. In his remarks, he stressed that:

1. Planning is a continuous process in which priorities shift from year to year and an annual review of the established planning priorities is necessary.

2. As Chancellor, he will endorse the planning priorities established by the Charrette and see to the translation of these priorities into budgetary allocations or reallocations.

3. The Governing Board of the District is the last word in all matters, but the Board should recognize the validity of the planning process and accept, as input, the recommendations made by the Charrette participants and other District planning groups as being major components of the District's educational blueprint.

4. Many hours have been expended by College and District planning groups, and it is appropriate to coalesce recommendations, formulate action plans, and provide for their implementation in the budgetary process.

Dr. Elsner then introduced Mr. Max Tadlock, of Tadlock Associates Incorporated, as the floor manager of the Charrette. Mr. Tadlock provided a focus for the "White Paper" presentations of the College Presidents which were to follow. Mr. Tadlock pointed out that the Presidents were to present their own biases and perceptions of their institutions which, in turn, would serve to set a tone, style, and direction for the Maricopa County Community College District.

Prior to the presentations by the College Presidents, Mr. Mike Svaco, Director of Analytical Studies, gave a brief summary of current college enrollment patterns and the characteristics of community college students.

Dr. Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Educational Development, introduced the District College Presidents. Individual presentations were made by:

1. Dr. Arthur DeCabooter, Scottsdale Community College
2. Dr. William Berry, Phoenix College
3. Dr. John Waltrip, Glendale Community College
4. Mr. Theo Heap, Mesa Community College

5. Mr. Walter Morrison, Rio Salado Community College
6. Dr. Norbert Bruemmer, Maricopa Technical Community College
7. Dr. Raul Cardenas, South Mountain Community College

The perceptions or concerns shared by a majority of the Presidents in their presentations were that:

1. There is a common recognition of the need for continuous educational planning and priority setting at the Colleges and the District.

2. There is an immediate need for decisions to be made on educational priorities accompanied by budgetary commitments and timetables for implementing plans.

3. The July 1978 Report of the Joint Council on Educational Priorities neglected to mention and place an appropriate priority on the continued and prominent role played by transfer and general education in the District.

4. Occupational education will become an increasingly important component of the Colleges' educational programming. This fact has been recognized in the Colleges' long-range plans, and there is a need for a commitment and a decision on priorities by the Governing Board in order to provide needed direction.

5. Developmental education programs are becoming a necessity, and effective action is needed to meet this need.

6. Changes in all areas of education, particularly new delivery systems, will require continued staff development programs for faculty to remain current.

Some other important topics emphasized by one or more of the College Presidents were that:

1. Attention should be given to promoting efforts to revise the State's 45th Day funding method because of the Law's effect of placing constraints on flexible scheduling and programming.

2. The College's potential or continued ability to accommodate present or future enrollments is being seriously hampered because of the need for new or improved facilities.

3. A decision is necessary on the future of health sciences education in the District. Program stagnation and deterioration are real possibilities because of the lack of direction for these programs.

4. Maricopa Technical Community College should retain and administer the health sciences programs because of the institution's reputation and record of success in this area. MTCC should continue to serve on a County-wide basis as the District College which offers high cost and unique occupational programs.

Following the College Presidents, Mr. A. W. Flowers, Executive Vice Chancellor, gave a brief presentation on fiscal planning. Mr. Flowers emphasized that:

1. In the absence of a commitment to educational priorities, fiscal planning is predicated on a continuation of current operational patterns.

2. The major factors affecting fiscal planning are the:

   a. Effects of inflation
   b. Student enrollment projections
   c. Projected certificated salary levels

3. The District will need 15 million dollars to complete existing campuses, and it will cost an estimated 13 million dollars to construct South Mountain Community College.

Mr. Flowers also commented on the need to explore alternatives to current funding methods for the community colleges. He cited some areas which merit further exploration:

1. Incorporating an escalation factor into the State Law for funding of community colleges. (The State's dollar support per full-time student equivalent has remained constant while costs have continued to rise.)

2. Promoting special legislation to provide for the funding of facilities required by the handicapped student.

3. Increasing the State funding provided for occupational education.

4. Securing State assistance in funding the Skill Center.

5. Using student registration fees or tuition to reduce the amount needed from the District tax levy.

6. Using Revenue Bonds for financing the construction of classroom facilities. (A change in the Law is required.)

7. Using the District tax levy as an added source of capital funds for the purchase of equipment.

8. Using Lease-Purchase or Lease-With-Option-to-Purchase for capital requirements because of new legislation and planning activities.

9. The possibility of Federal funding for capital construction in the health area.

10. Making reductions or reallocations in selected areas of present District operations to achieve better use of existing resources.

Mr. Cliff Harkins, Member, State Board for Community Colleges, spoke briefly and commended the College Presidents on their presentations. He suggested that representatives of the elementary and high schools be invited to participate in future District planning conferences.

Mr. Max Tadlock resumed control as the floor manager for the Charrette and explained the operation of a Charrette. He presented the Task Force Groups with their first task: to reconsider the mission statement developed for the District by the Joint Council on Educational Priorities.

The remainder of the first session was spent in group discussions of the mission statement. Reports from each of the eight groups were to be made at the start of the second session.

SECOND SESSION

Friday, November 17, 1978

9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The second session began with the reports of the eight groups on the revised mission statement. After the presentations and discussion, Ms. Carlene Morris and Mr. Jim Mancuso, faculty members at Mesa Community College, were appointed to serve as a Special Task Force to write the revised mission statement which reflected the views of the Charrette participants. The revised mission statement adopted by the Charrette is:

> *The mission of the Maricopa Community Colleges is to make available to all of the County's residents the opportunity for lifelong learning through quality programs.*

Mr. Tadlock explained that the adopted mission statement was to serve as the Charrette premise--the standard which is the measure of the activities, events, and programs of the District. The mission statement is the logical premise, the principal assumption which reasonable and prudent people can use to judge if an activity is appropriate to the institution.

Individual tasks or problems were assigned to the Task Force Groups by Mr. Tadlock. The groups' discussions and the preparation of their reports on the assigned topics consumed the majority of the time in this secord session. The individual group reports began at 2:00 p.m.

GROUP I

TOPIC: The Role of Maricopa Technical Community College in the Maricopa County Community College District

GROUP LEADER: Dave Bydalek

GROUP REPORT: REVITALIZE MTCC, WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO BE THE SPECIALIZED COLLEGE FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION. (JCEP Priority #1)

Purposes:

A. To administer and operate new and existing one-of-a-kind occupational programs.

Rationale: Some programs, by the nature of their cost and/or enrollment, may not be cost effective if offered on various campuses; whereas, if consolidated, such programs would be offered at a single campus in a more economically prudent manner.

B. To administer and operate area occupational centers.

Rationale: Owing to the geographical size of the County and the potential demand for programs such as automotive, some occupational programs may be duplicated and be under the jurisdiction of MTCC. Two such centers could be established to serve, for example, the MCC and SCC areas on the east and the GCC and the proposed Litchfield/Goodyear areas on the west.

C. To serve the particular needs of downtown Phoenix.

Rationale: Because of the concentration of business and governmental occupations in downtown Phoenix, courses/programs in those areas would be offered at that location.

D. To provide occupational programs to complement South Mountain Community College programs.

Rationale: A greater breadth of offerings would be available to SMCC students than would otherwise be possible.

E. To administer and operate all new and existing allied health programs. (All nursing programs would continue at their existing locations.)

Other allied health programs on the campuses would be moved to MTCC as facilities are made available. Until such time, all allied health programs would be administered by MTCC.

Rationale: Centralized administration and operation of all allied health programs is desireable because (1) health care centers prefer to deal with one educational institution as opposed to a multitude of them, (2) health accrediting agencies would have only one educational institution to deal with, and (3) management of the complex allied health programs would likely be more efficient under a single administration that has broad experience in many specialized health areas.

F. To provide the second year of high-cost, low-enrollment occupational programs offered throughout the District.

Rationale: Centralization would insure the offering of the second year of two-year programs with the greatest possible savings.

G. Facility Recommendation: Entire 40th Street land and facility be allocated to MTCC for program development, particularly in the allied health fields. District headquarters might be relocated to 106 East Washington Street. The 106 site could have space dedicated to MTCC to house administrative offices and for the offerings of courses/programs to serve downtown Phoenix.

JURY REMARKS:

1. Is this a problem of saving a college or meeting student needs?
2. Does centralizing programs insure continuity and promote student retention?
3. Is not institutional proximity the most significant determinant of student attendance?
4. The Skill Center thrived and grew when transferred to its present 40th Street location.

GROUP II

TOPIC: What is the role of the Maricopa County Community College District as a part of the statewide system of postsecondary education?

GROUP LEADER: Betty Field

GROUP REPORT: The JCEP Report recommendations were reviewed and compared to the perceived role of the District as part of the statewide system.

A. Occupational Education: Programs in occupational education should be a top priority as stated in the JCEP Report. The community colleges in the State, appropriately, have the responsibility of providing specific occupational programs for all of the citizens of the State. To maintain a proper balance with other programs and to remain financially feasible, consideration should be given to (a) centralizing some occupational programs, and (b) regionalizing others to make them available on all campuses. This applies statewide.

B. Transfer Education: A significant omission in the JCEP Report is the community colleges' responsibility in the area of transfer programs. Transfer programs have been, and will continue to be, a very important part of our educational mission. Maintaining the current high level of our regular transfer programs is certainly a priority, and caution should be exercised in funding new occupational programs. A disproportionate allocation of resources to occupational or developmental education programs can, quite possibly, result in serious neglect of the transfer education programs.

C. Developmental Education: From a state system perspective, we concur with this priority. The community college may be that segment of the state system which is most responsible for providing developmental education opportunities for adults. We see developmental education as it was defined in JCEP to include those in need of basic skills as well as those who could benefit from advanced programs.

We do not feel that the priority statement in JCEP should include a specific recommendation for separate departments in developmental education. As we do not like the State to dictate methods to the District, we would hope that the District would allow flexibility in the way the Colleges respond to the developmental needs of their students.

D. Improved Delivery Systems: We agree with this priority but would encourage expansion of the statement to include a leadership role in the creation of a Statewide consortium so that resources (i.e. people, materials, and programs) can be shared. We recognize that new delivery systems which involve educational technology have multiple uses. We must develop effective ways to share these systems and materials with the District and with the State. For example, we can develop quality video or audio programs more cost-effectively as a consortium. We can share and trade individualized learning packages designed to reach new clientele. We can move away from the "not invented here" syndrome which has sometimes surfaced in the past. Through improved delivery systems, we can increase the learning options for our students.

E. Staff Development: From a statewide viewpoint, staff development must be provided with a focus on retraining our staff in new instructional areas and support services. With our changing clientele and the infusion of new delivery systems, we must demonstrate a commitment to the lifelong learning needs of the people who comprise our organization. As a unit of a statewide system, we live within the personnel laws and regulations. We recognize the value of the people within our organization and feel that staff development is critical to the maintenance of our District's vitality.

Perhaps we should examine what staff development we should do ourselves and what we should require the State universities to provide for us.

JURY REMARKS:

1. In some cases, the report did not tie JCEP to the statewide role.

2. Articulation among the high schools, universities, and community colleges should be carefully worked out. Students should be given credit for the competencies they have developed.

3. The report did not mention the State's role in support of staff development.

4. Does the State have any responsibility for additional funding for developmental education?

5. In the endorsement, why was the role of the Governing Board omitted?

GROUP III

TOPIC: Occupational Education from the Institutional Point of View

GROUP LEADER: Dr. John Messer

GROUP REPORT:

Occupational Education

Problem: Occupational education has finally achieved a high priority of recognition in the District. However, we need to get off dead center and into development of viable occupational programs and deal with problem areas such as:

*Allocating programs
*Facilities
*Equipment
*Staffing
*Serving a large and growing area for providing student access
*Meeting needs of employers throughout the County
*Coping with new and expanding technologies
*Articulation with other educational institutions
*High expense programs where duplication is not feasible (i.e. Allied Health)

These problems are too complex to be decided individually by six different educational entities. Therefore, leadership is required with the responsibility and authority to direct occupational training addressing the above problems on a County-wide basis.

The JCEP Report: The following comments refer to the JCEP Report of June 1978. Our comments below follow in the same order as those in the JCEP.

A. Having occupational education as the first priority of the JCEP Report is appropriate, but we would add:

"The student in occupational courses and programs will be benefited by a performance-oriented, competency-based approach in instruction and a commitment to following the student through the job placement process."

B. Developmental education should occupy a priority status, but it should be task oriented for occupational education. For example, students should be able to acquire the specific mathematics preparation needed for the entry-level requirements of electronics or automotive technology.

C. With respect to student attrition, an improved understanding of the causes is necessary. As a start, the causes of student attrition due to dissatisfaction with the services provided should be investigated in a pilot study conducted over the next two years.

D. Attracting new clientele is important, but we take exception to the JCEP document in its use of the term "disadvantaged" to apply to an entire category of people who may not be "disadvantaged". The JCEP wording should be changed or eliminated. For example, reentering women, veterans, or the elderly are not necessarily physically, economically, socially, or educationally "disadvantaged".

We would also change the second paragraph of this section in JCEP to read:

"A review of existing demographic data and an assessment of the educational needs of the potential students should lead to plans and actions which attempt to match or relate college programs to the needs of unserved clientele in occupational education." (Underline denotes changes in JCEP wording.)

E. "...should include assessments of manpower needs analysis from an employer's point of view in order to properly serve existing and new student groups by Fall 1980." (Underline denotes changes in JCEP wording in par. E.)

F. "...recommends that delivery systems be continually reviewed, improved where indicated, and/or developed to better meet the needs." (Underline denotes changes in JCEP wording in par. F.)

G. Add to Priority G, paragraph #3, JCEP: "business/industry"

H. Add: "...to examine this issue, with a special focus on occupational program development."

I. "...resources be allocated for faculty and staff development to insure up-to-date knowledge of technical advances and developments in occupational areas."

J. Add to Priority J:

"Attention should be given to special problem areas in occupational education such as flexible time scheduling, more efficient use of facilities, and moving away from lock-stepped lecture/lab combinations.

JURY REMARKS:

1. More description is needed of the role to be played by the new District occupational position mentioned.

2. The report did not address the conflict between the student's desire for a community-based education and the District's desire to hold down costs.

3. How can the conflict be resolved between the College's desire to serve its community and the recommendation for need for centralized decision making in occupational education?

4. What solution is there for the occupational student unable to enroll in needed courses already filled by non-occupational students?

GROUP IV

TOPIC: The Student's Perspective on Occupational Education

GROUP LEADER: Ralph Norton

GROUP REPORT: We agree with the priorities established by JCEP and we began our work by taking a sentence from the first JCEP recommendation, "The need for thorough educational planning becomes imperative because of the far-reaching implications of this recommendation." Our recommendations begin with these thoughts on educational planning.

A. Planning: Planning must be conducted within the context of lifelong learning. A student in occupational education may wish to return for additional work in transfer education, and occupational education must not be so narrow as to present obstacles to further general or transfer education.

Plans should relate to and identify with a community-based college.

The educational priorities of occupational programs must be based on flexibility and opportunity for further education.

B. Curriculum: General education models should be proposed for courses with fewer credits taking less time--including developmental courses for occupational education and competency-based courses going throughout the curriculum. Interdisciplinary courses, occupational, and general education courses should be tailored for occupational students. Open-entry, open-exit courses, intersemester courses, and courses tailored for the handicapped student should be developed. The present curriculum should be reviewed for duplications and alternate offerings.

C. Advisory Committees: We believe that advisory committees will play a major role in occupational education, but those already in existence should meet more frequently and have more communication with college personnel outside of the occupational area.

We recommend a District-wide Advisory Board consisting of consultants from business, the retirement community, and politics to assist in advising or counseling on occupational education.

We also recommend a Student Advisory Committee be established to assist in developing and assessing occupational programs.

D. Registration and Scheduling: There should be on-line registration at every College and one admissions process that registers a student for any of the District Colleges. There should be a review of class scheduling, day and evening, to be sure that classes are being offered at the times most suited to the needs of the students.

E. Staff Development: Full-time faculty who are under-utilized in a discipline experiencing declining enrollments could be prepared for teaching interdisciplinary occupational courses. Staff development could also be used to prepare faculty for advising in the special occupational areas and to assist faculty in developing special programs for the handicapped students. Visiting staff should be included in staff development programs.

F. Student Follow-Up: There should be a follow-up and tracking of former students in order to secure needed information on their progress and an evalution of the College's effect on their lives.

G. Counseling: A program should be established for screening students for the purpose of predicting success. The intent is to increase the chances for student success and to provide alternatives.

H. Delivery Systems: All of the differing forms of alternative delivery systems should be examined, including occupational programs with general education and theory courses based at the Colleges and the second-year work done at MTCC or some central site.

I. Developmental Education: Programs in developmental education should include considerations of language labs, tutoring, and related education.

JURY REMARKS:

1. The Advisory Council might be wider based if more community agencies were included, such as Voc Rehab or Workmen's Compensation.

2. The recommendation on screening bothered me--was it for entry into special programs or what?

GROUP V

TOPIC: The Role of General Education and Transfer Education in the District

GROUP LEADER: Anne Cowan

GROUP REPORT:

Point of View of the Institution

Transfer education and general education are primary goals of the comprehensive community colleges as suggested by the Presidential Papers and the State Board's Philosophy. Transfer and general education are separate entities even though overlap exists.

General/Transfer Education (to be included in the JCEP Report)

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that general education and transfer courses retain their important place in the overall program of the Colleges and that such courses be developed or revised as changing needs dictate. It is recognized that the same courses may be used for different purposes by different students: That is, for one student the course might serve an occupational purpose, for a second it might be a transfer course, and for a third it might serve a general education purpose.

1. Transfer or Baccalaureate parallel courses should be of the highest quality to prepare a student for upper division work and should be carefully articulated with the programs of four-year colleges and universities.

2. General education courses should provide the opportunity for the development of the individual as a total person, contribute to the enhancement of the quality of life, and encourage responsible citizenship. This will be accomplished through an increasing awareness of the human cultural heritage and the awareness of the nature of the physical world in which we live.

3. General and transfer courses should include emphasis relevant to the growing internationalism evident in today's world.

4. We recommend the establishment of a General Education Council which will function to assess and review ongoing programs in general education.

JCEP Priorities

A. Occupational Education: We have concerns about the limited use of "occupational education", and we endorse the concept of general education for the "whole" student. We would include general education as an option, not mandatory, and suitable or appropriate to student needs.

B. Developmental Education: We support the inclusive definition as it will help general education and transfer programs.

C. Student Retention: Relates to everyone.

D. Attracting New Clientele: Appropriate to general education/transfer education.

E. Ongoing Assessment and Identification of the Clientele Groups to be Served: Fine as is.

F. Improved Delivery Systems: Insert general education and transfer education as benefiting from improved instruction. More emphasis should be placed on the potential of interdisciplinary approaches in general education.

G. Campaign of Community Involvement: Include a campaign for promoting general education. "Advertise" its functions and responsibilities.

H. Delineations of Functions and Responsibilities: Pertains to organization.

I. Increased Resources for Faculty and Staff Development: Foresee staff development in internationalism.

J. Funding New Concepts: No comment.

K. Develop a Systematic Process of Evaluation: We recognize the need for high standards and consistency in courses, but we wish to allow for individual styles of instruction.

JURY REMARKS:

1. Do you see any need for basing general education on a student's need rather than on a program's need, especially in view of the fact that students may already possess the required competencies in general education?

2. I would like to see the General Education Council replace something rather than be added on.

3. Perhaps, if students were appropriately advised, they might see a great deal more benefit from general education.

4. I don't think it's enough to hope that our transfer students will have an occupation; I think we have to take some responsibility.

5. I wonder if we haven't clouded the definition of general education by saying it's okay to use transfer courses for two purposes.

6. We need a clean definition of general education--a redefinition of the liberal arts is also needed; we need to carve out a relevant curriculum for ourselves.

GROUP VI

TOPIC: Focus on Developmental Education

GROUP LEADER: John Cordova

GROUP REPORT: We did not review all of the topics covered in JCEP, but we concentrated on our given topic. Our first task went right to the heart of the problem--to sharpen the definition of developmental education:

Definition of Developmental Education

Developmental education is characterized as an interdisciplinary approach to provide academic and social skills for students in an integrated environment. It includes verbal and quantitative skills and develops self-reliance through the improvement of self-image. Developmental education recognizes acculturation and its effect on learning. It seeks to take students with ability/potential and improve their skills to enable them to achieve their educational goals.

Clarification and Definitions

1. Interdisciplinary: Any combination of approaches that will enhance learning, i.e. coping skills can be learned in the social sciences, mathematics, etc.

2. Acculturation: Recognizes cultural differences and factors which affect the learning process.

3. Integrated environment: One which does not isolate the learner.

Current Efforts Related to Developmental Education EXAMPLES (not all-inclusive):

*Writing Skills Labs
*Open-Entry/Open-Exit Math Labs
*Language Skills Courses
*TICCIT
*SIN (Success in Nursing)
*Study Skills Courses
*Developmental Block
*Learning Assistance Centers
*Several Remedial Courses
*Several Developmental Courses
*Counseling Courses
*Diagnostic/Prescription Testing for Personalized Programs
*Cognitive Style Mapping
*Peer Tutoring/Advisement
*Faculty Tutoring/Advisement

Assessment of Current Problems

1. A strong developmental education policy statement is needed.

2. There seems to be a minimal College/District assessment of the problem.

3. The developmental education thrust is fragmented (lack of District-wide coordination).

4. It is not known if present staff and programs can address developmental education needs. (A full-fledged program may require additional staff.)

5. A need exists to allocate resources, not just financial, to develop a comprehensive developmental education program.

6. There is a limited commitment for funding flexibility in staffing ratios.

7. There is a lack of commitment for testing. Testing is needed to determine at what level a student should begin.

Summary

Since the Maricopa County Community College District has endorsed the "open door" policy, which admits students of varying preparation, it must attend to developmental education. It is necessary that such a program of education complement the developmental concept in terms of a comprehensive, integrated, and coordinated effort without sacrificing human dignity.

Developmental education is a common ingredient to all of the program offerings. The success of developmental education will result in increased enrollments in occupational programs, improvement of student retention, and attraction of new clientele. In addition, ongoing assessment and improved or new teaching methods might be provided.

The quality of the end product is directly dependent on the success of the developmental educational effort.

Recommendation

It is recommended that an assessment of existing developmental education efforts and needs be immediately undertaken. Based on results of the assessment, it is further recommended that a program be developed and implemented.

JURY REMARKS:

1. What is the District's role in implementing the recommendation on developmental education?

2. I would hope that some additional recommendations come out of this that establish a direction and pull the diverse elements together.

3. Was any consideration given to developing competency-based objectives for measuring a student's progress in developmental programs?

4. Was any thought given to developing a variety of courses that would enable students to start their occupational or academic programs at lower-than-college-level while continuing their skills development?

5. In the diagnostic testing area, you might look to outside established testing programs--like DES, for example.

GROUP VII

TOPIC: The Role of Student Services in the District

GROUP LEADER: Jean Tease

GROUP REPORT: Student Personnel Services was viewed by our group to be a fundamental and integral part of the total educational process. The group focused on three areas: (1) What are the functions of Student Personnel Services? (2) What are the problems? (3) How does Student Personnel Services relate to JCEP?

A Review of Student Personnel Services Functions

1. Orientation Functions

   *Pre-College Information
   *Student Induction
   *Group Orientation
   *Career Information
   *Personnel Records
   *Educational Testing
   *Applicant Appraisal

2. Consultation Functions

   *Student Counseling
   *Student Advisement
   *Applicant Counseling

3. Participation Functions

*Student Self-Government
*Co-Curricular Activities
*Athletics

4. Instructional Functions

*Development
*Academic Skills

5. Regulation Functions

*Student Registration
*Academic Regulation
*Social Regulation

6. Service Functions

*Financial Aids
*Placement

7. Organizational Functions

*Program Articulation
*In-Service Education
*Program Evaluation
*Student Personnel Services Organization

8. Special Functions

*Health Services
*Learning Assistance Center
*Veterans and Other People-Oriented Services

9. Ancillary Functions

*Child Care
*Security
*Parking
*Legal Aid
*Lost and Found
*I.D.

Review of Perceived Student Personnel Problems

1. Lack of understanding about the role and functions of Student Personnel Services.

2. Lack of District/College commitment.

3. Lack of support for College autonomy.

4. Lack of cooperation among College personnel.

5. Need for role clarity or redefinition.

6. Need for staff development.

Student Personnel Services and the JCEP Report

While we did not go through and comment on the entire JCEP Report, we did attempt to relate those recommendations in the JCEP Report which, in our opinion, most directly affected Student Personnel Services. We felt that Student Personnel Services are not addressed enough or highlighted in the JCEP Report, and there is a need for this emphasis because of a lack of understanding of the role of Student Personnel Services.

A. Student Personnel Services and Occupational Education

1. Career Development Program

*Career Exploration (for undecided students)
*Program Advisement (for students committed to career goals)
*Placement and Liaison to Community Advisory Groups
*Student Follow-Up

2. Needs

*Training of Personnel in Career Advisement
*Establishment and Staffing of Career Centers
*Placement and Follow-Up Staffing

B. Student Personnel Services and Developmental Education

1. Diagnosis

*Testing
*Counseling
*Advising

2. Teaching

*"Academic Survival Skills" Classes
*Educational, Personal, and Career Development Courses

3. Support Services

*Tutoring
*Peer Counselors/Peer Tutors (Supervision and Training by)

C. Student Personnel Services and Student Retention

1. Orientation (SPS takes leadership)

*Faculty
*Peer — Shared Responsibility
*Counselor

2. "Early Detection System"

*Student Personnel Services Provides System
*Trains People to Carry Out Aspects of System

3. Special Services

*Counseling (Personal and Academic)
*Interest Group Support
*Tutoring
*Financial Aids

D. Attracting New (Underserved or Unserved) Clientele

1. Staffing (Role Models)

2. Staff Development for Sensitizing to New Clientele

3. Special Services

*Cultural Events
*Tutoring and Other Academic Services
*Facilities Adaptation for the Handicapped
*Financial Aids
*Child Care
*Re-Entry Programs

E. Quicker Access and Better Service

1. Recommended Services

*On-Line Registration
*Pert Chart: A Critical Path for Each Class
*Open-Entry and Open-Exit Option
*Central Campus Student Information System
*Information Flowchart be Developed for Each Campus

F. Improved Communications (Recommended Revision for JCEP)

"The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that communications be improved whereby the unexpected is eliminated. Efforts must be made in the planning and priority setting activities of the Colleges and the District to incorporate more effective formal and informal communications channels in order to reach those staff directly affected by change. Additional improved communications are needed at the Colleges and the District to keep staff, students, and community members informed."

Recommendation on Student Personnel Services

We recommend that the role and functions of Student Personnel Services be identified and communicated throughout the individual Colleges and the District through such processes as seminars, charrettes, and the dissemination of reports (e.g. Clement's Report and the Young Report)

JURY REMARKS:

1. No mention was made of the disparity between the services provided the Day and Evening Divisions.

GROUP VIII

TOPIC: Focus on Resources

GROUP LEADER: Bob Little

GROUP REPORT:

A. Critical Questions for the Justification of the Use of Resources

We need to know:

1. Whom do we serve? What are their needs?
2. What do we do? What kinds of programs do we develop and how do we deliver those programs?
3. Did we deliver?

Planning will not succeed unless an evaluation program is an integral part of our activities. We need to know what we are doing for the students and how well we have provided service. A better student follow-up system is a necessity because the ultimate criterion of how well we succeed is the measure of the influence we have had on students--a year--five years after they have left our Colleges.

B. Potential or New Resources: A Critical Fiscal Issue

We need to:

1. Actively study the impact of alternative fee structures, including tuition.
2. Consider the impact and ensuing District responsibility of the use or non-use of Federal funds.
3. Consider the impact of increasing the County tax levy in light of Proposition 101.
4. Support State funding increases for:

   *Handicapped
   *Educationally Disadvantaged
   *High-Cost Occupational Programs
   *Escalating Costs Tied to Inflation
5. Investigate the use of funds from foundations and other agencies.
6. Establish an Office of Resource Development.

JURY REMARKS:

1. Resources are much more than funding. The apparent synonymous use of those two words deserves comment because they can have very different meanings. Perhaps our greatest resource is the faculty, and of course, funding provides the faculty, but care should be taken in labeling a list "resources" and then proceeding to talk exclusively about money. Money can help, in some cases, but additional monies are not a cure-all.

2. There was an inadequate emphasis on assessing student needs from a student's viewpoint rather than from the community's viewpoint.

3. More details could have been provided in the discussion of resources.

CLOSING REMARKS BY DR. PAUL ELSNER

1. Melt down the JCE's recommendations to a final document in simple non-jargon terms.

2. Take them immediately to the Governing Board.

3. Ask for their endorsement by the Governing Board, or their rejection, so we know where we stand on these priorities.

4. Request a balance-type formula from the Board for budget building. One possibility is:

   For every dollar saved or taken out of encumbrance, the Board puts up a factor such as $1.20 or $1.10 for new initiatives on the priority list.

5. Governing Board sets aside a percentage of budget for approved (by Governing Board) proposals from Colleges for exemplary programs out of contingencies, unencumbrances, and normal ending balances.

6. Cost out a three-year program of priorities and identify the resources:

   a) Tax Rate
   b) Tuition and Fees
   c) State Aid Formulas
   d) Reallocation of Costs

7. As far as the educational priorities are concerned, once the Governing Board has approved them, I believe that close to 50% could be achieved without new resources; but the Board must realize that additional funding will be required.

1978 Jcep

Report to the Governing Board
Maricopa Community Colleges

1 9 7 8

THE MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Glendale Community College
Maricopa Technical Community College
Mesa Community College
Phoenix College
Rio Salado Community College
Scottsdale Community College
South Mountain Community College

GOVERNING BOARD

Robert L. Robertson, President

Barbara Hitchcock, Secretary
Ross N. Farnsworth, Member
Robert Martinez, Member
William N. Schindel, Member
Merrill Gran Christensen, Member-Elect

ADMINISTRATION

Paul A. Elsner, Chancellor

THE JOINT COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES

Floretta Awe, Administration, PC
Alex Backus, Faculty, MTCC
William Berry, President, PC
Don Bradshaw, Administration, SCC
Norbert I. Bruemmer, President, MTCC
Mildred Bulpitt, Administration, DSSC
Ron Bush, Vice-Chancellor
Dave Bydalek, Faculty, MTCC
Raul Cardenas, President, SMCC
Steve Carson, Administration, PC
Anne Cowan, Faculty, MCC
Ruth Cox, Faculty, SCC
Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr., Vice-Chancellor
Arthur DeCabooter, President, SCC
Georgia Dillard, Faculty, PC
A. W. Flowers, Exec. Vice-Chancellor
Theo Heap, Acting President, MCC
Myles Hill, Faculty, PC
Norm Johansen, Administration, MCC
Fred Keyworth, Administration, MCC
John Messer, Administration, PC
Walt Morrison, President, RSCC
Marilee Murray, Faculty, GCC
Nancy Noll, Administration, GCC
Rodger Slater, Faculty, SCC
C. B. Smith, Administration, DSSC
Mike Svaco, Administration, DSSC
William Wallace, Administration, PC
John Waltrip, President, GCC
Charles West, Faculty, GCC

THE JOINT COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES

REPORT

to the

GOVERNING BOARD OF THE MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

December 5, 1978

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities

The need for a solid conceptual foundation to guide the District's long-range planning efforts led to the creation of the Joint Council on Educational Priorities. In January of 1978, Chancellor Elsner defined the work of this group of faculty and administrators in his document, "The Chancellor's Blueprint for Long-Range Planning." The Joint Council was charged to provide, on an annual basis, the ten most important educational priorities of the District, because limited resources foreclosed on any possibility of accommodating all of the requests for changes or improvements in the educational activities of the District.

The Report

The first version of this report was developed by the Joint Council on Educational Priorities in June of 1978. A subsequent review and revision of the report was done by the 70 participants of a planning charrette sponsored by the Community College District on November 16-17, 1978. The revised report was presented and adopted at the regular December 5, 1978 meeting of the Governing Board of the Maricopa Community Colleges.

The purpose of this report is to formally identify the planning priorities of the Community College District for the 1978-79 Academic Year. This report is intended to serve as a guide for those responsible for planning and implementing the educational programs and activities of the Colleges in the District. As a reference, the report will also provide College personnel, students, and community members with a better understanding of the decisions which determine the allocation of resources in the District.

CONTENTS

	Page
PHILOSOPHY	1
MISSION	2
THE IMMEDIATE PRIORITY	3
PART I. EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES	3
Occupational Education	3
Developmental Education	4
General/Transfer Education	4
Student Personnel Services	4
Attracting New Clientele	5
Ongoing Assessment	5
Delivery Systems	5
Community Involvement	6
Functions and Responsibilities	6
Staff Development	6
New Concepts	6
Evaluation	7
Communications	7
Providing Access	7
PART II. EXTENDED PROCESSES AND ACTIVITIES	7
Educational Planning	7
Facilities	8
PART III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8
Introduction	8
Chancellor's Planning Questions - I	9
Chancellor's Planning Questions - II	10
REFERENCES	12

STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy of the Maricopa Community Colleges is that of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona:

The philosophy of the Arizona community college system is a reflection of the purpose of a free democratic society: government of, by, and for the people. This can be best achieved by an educated populace so that all may exercise intelligently and morally the rights, privileges, and duties of self-government. This entails the affirmation that each individual has worth and dignity, must be afforded an opportunity to develop skills and talents, and must share the responsibilities of providing educational services with the community.

Further, the philosophy recognizes that education is a vital life-long process that--like the society to which it responds--is never static nor completely realized. Education in a democratic society aims to equip all members with the knowledge and techniques necessary for coping with the economic, social, and political dynamics affecting not only the individual but also the community.

It is therefore appropriate that the individual, the community, and the state should share the financing and governance of the community college system. At the district level, fiscal and educational policy can be determined by local needs. At the state level, it is imperative to establish standards, and to assess and coordinate needs and services in the best interest of the state.

Because the communities in Arizona differ widely in demographic, economic, and geographical characteristics, the community colleges of Arizona must be permitted relative autonomy and a variety of curricula. But each community college must be committed to the following general objectives:

1. To offer the first two years of baccalaureate parallel or preprofessional courses of the highest quality, so that students enrolled in transfer programs may complete study for the baccalaureate in four-year colleges and universities.

2. To provide occupational programs in technical, vocational, and paraprofessional fields leading to an associate degree or a certificate, and to provide retraining and upgrading of skills in these fields, so that students enrolled in occupational programs are qualified to meet current needs of the labor market.

3. To provide appropriate general education for all citizens, so that they may perform their personal and professional roles more effectively, and exercise their obligations and privileges as citizens more intelligently.

4. To offer programs in continuing education for those who wish to improve professional skills, acquire new ones, or expand their fields of knowledge and general interest.

5. To provide sound academic and occupational counseling, including job placement services, so that students may learn to define their goals clearly and pursue them realistically.

6. To provide cultural and community service programs for the enrichment of the community, and to encourage the use of community college facilities and services by all citizens of the community for educational and cultural purposes.

Finally, a democratic society prizes and values individual differences. The role of the community college is to encourage men and women of all ages to develop their skills and talents differently, each according to abilities and interests, so that collectively they contribute to the continuum of democracy.

MISSION

Charrette Revision:

The mission of the Maricopa Community Colleges is to make available to all of the county's residents the opportunity for lifelong learning through quality programs.

THE IMMEDIATE PRIORITY

From The Charrette Presidential Papers

While there is a common recognition of the need for continuous educational planning and priority setting at the Colleges and the District, immediate decisions are required on these priorities accompanied by budgetary commitments and timetables for implementing plans. The Governing Board must make a commitment to priorities which provide the needed direction.

PART I. EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES

A. Occupational Education

Emphasis on Occupational Education

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that policies and procedures be developed that provide programs for job-ready training which minimize the completion time required and maximize the skill development to meet job market demands.

Charrette Reinforces Need For Decisions

Occupational education will become an increasingly important component of the Colleges' educational programming. This has been recognized in the Colleges' plans and priorities, but direction has to be provided in order to deal with the problems of:

*Class Scheduling
*Allocating Programs
*Facilities
*Equipment
*Staffing
*Serving a large and growing area
*Meeting needs of employers
*Coping with new and expanding technologies
*Articulation with other educational institutions
*High expense programs where duplication is not feasible (i.e. Allied Health)

Role of MTCC In Occupational Education

These problems are too complex to be decided individually by six different campuses. A decision on the future role of Maricopa Technical Community College is a key factor affecting the solutions to the problems cited. The Charrette Report recommended that the District:

> REVITALIZE MTCC, WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO BE THE SPECIALIZED COLLEGE FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION.

The recommendation also states that MTCC should administer and operate:

(1) New and existing one-of-a-kind occupational programs.

(2) Area occupational centers.

(3) All new and existing Allied Health Programs. (Nursing programs would continue at existing locations.)

B. Developmental Education

Emphasis Needed

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that plans and programs for developmental education begin immediately.

Charrette Provides Reason and Scope...

Since the Maricopa County Community College District has endorsed the "open door" policy which admits students of varying preparation, it must attend to developmental education. It is necessary that such a program of education complement the developmental concept in terms of a comprehensive, integrated, and coordinated effort without sacrificing human dignity.

And Provides A New Definition

The College programs for developmental education should adopt the following definition:

> Developmental education is characterized as an interdisciplinary approach to provide academic and social skills for students in an integrated environment. It includes verbal and quantitative skills and develops self-reliance through the improvement of self-image. Developmental education recognizes acculturation and its effects on learning. It seeks to take students with ability/potential and improve their skills to enable them to achieve their educational goals.

C. General/Transfer Education

A New Priority From The Charrette

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that general education and transfer courses retain their important place in the overall program of the Colleges and that such courses be developed or revised as changing needs dictate. It is recognized that the same courses may be used for different purposes by different students: That is, for one student the course might serve an occupational purpose, for a second it might be a transfer course, and for a third it might serve a general education purpose.

Transfer Education Is Part of Our Mission

A significant omission in the original JCEP Report is the community college's responsibility in the area of transfer programs. Transfer programs have been, and will continue to be, a very important part of our educational mission. Maintaining a current high level of our regular transfer programs is certainly a priority.

D. Student Personnel Services

Charrette View on Student Personnel Services

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that the role and functions of Student Personnel Services be identified and communicated throughout the individual Colleges and the District through such processes as seminars, charrettes, and the dissemination of reports. (Clements' Report and The Young Report)

It was felt that Student Personnel Services were not addressed enough or highlighted in the original JCEP Report, and there is a need for this emphasis because of a lack of understanding of the role of Student Personnel Services.

E. Student Retention

Improve Retention Rates

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that a thorough investigation be made of the causes of student attrition within and between semesters, and that plans be implemented, as soon as possible, to improve the rate of student retention.

Charrette Recommends A Beginning

An improved understanding of the causes of student attrition should begin with an investigation of our students' dissatisfaction with the services provided. This should be done in a pilot study conducted over the next two years.

F. Attracting New Clientele

Students Not Presently Being Served

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that plans and activities to attract new clientele continue to expand at the Colleges. The "new clientele" includes those identified as the physically, economically, socially, or educationally disadvantaged, as well as others who traditionally have not been served.

Charrette Revisions Underlined

A review of existing demographic data and an assessment of the educational needs of the potential students should lead to plans and actions which attempt to match or relate College programs to the needs of unserved clientele.

G. Ongoing Assessment and Identification of the Clientele Groups to be Served

Charrette Revision Includes Manpower Needs

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that College and District planning should include assessments of the community and of the manpower needs from an employer's point of view in order to properly serve existing and new student groups. An assessment of educational needs ensures relevant and balanced program development.

H. Improved Delivery Systems

Revised Charrette Recommendation

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that delivery systems be continually reviewed, improved where indicated, and/or developed to better meet the needs of a diverse student population. Methods of instruction, possibly involving new technologies, should be tried, and plans should be made for implementing proven methods.

Consortium For Sharing

The Colleges should assume a leadership role in the creation of a statewide consortium so that resources (i.e. people, materials, and programs) can be shared. New delivery systems which involve educational technology have multiple uses, and the District must develop effective ways to share these systems and materials with the State.

I. Program of Community Involvement

Gaining Support and Involvement

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that a broadly based program of community involvement be initiated. In addition to effective public relations which articulate the educational and cultural services of the College to the community, the Colleges should seek the active participation of community members, business/industry, and other educational and governmental agencies.

J. Delineation of Functions and Responsibilities

Procedure And Role Responsibilities

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that a program be established which examines and delineates the functions and responsibilities of the Board, Administration (District and Colleges), Faculty, and Staff. While work is in progress to recodify and clarify Board Policy, attention should now be focused on developing procedures and defining the respective responsibilities which effectively implement Board Policy.

K. Increased Resources for Faculty and Staff Development

Staff Development For Change

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that increased resources be allocated for faculty and staff development. The Council believes that the level of expenditure for staff development will need to increase significantly to match the magnitude of educational change recommended for this District.

Charrette Cites Lifelong Learning Needs of District Employees

Staff development must be provided with a focus on retraining staff in instructional areas and support services. With changing clientele and the infusion of new delivery systems, the District must demonstrate a commitment to the lifelong learning needs of the people who comprise the organization. The District recognizes the value of the people within the organization and feels that staff development is critical to the maintenance of its vitality.

L. Funding New Concepts

Encouraging New Ideas

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that the District provide a more flexible and responsive system for funding the exploration and implementation of new concepts. Exploring ways to improve instruction or implementing the changes implied by new District priorities can be made more effective by improved funding strategies. For example, attention could be directed towards special problem areas in occupational education such as flexible time scheduling, more efficient use of facilities, and moving away from lock-stepped lecture/lab combinations.

M. Develop a Systematic Process of Evaluation

Measure of Effectiveness

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that a systematic process of evaluation be implemented which measures the effectiveness of the District program. The current activity of setting District goals and priorities should create a standard of measurement from which a more comprehensive plan of evaluation can evolve.

Charrette Calls For Student Follow-Up

Planning will not succeed unless an evaluation program is an integral part of educational activities. The District needs to know what it is doing for the student and how well it has served. A better student follow-up system is a necessity, because ultimately, the criterion of success is the measure of the effect education has had on students.

N. Improved Communications

Charrette Amplifies Original Recommendation

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that communications be improved whereby the unexpected is eliminated. Efforts must be made in the planning and priority setting activities of the Colleges and the District to incorporate more effective formal and informal communications channels in order to reach those staff directly affected by change. Improved communications are needed at the Colleges and the District to keep staff, students, and community members informed.

O. Providing Quicker Access and Better Service

Improved Access and Information Services

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that quicker access to the educational services of the College be provided by having on-line registration. The Joint Council on Educational Priorities also recommends that better informational services be provided by having improved Management Information Systems. These two recommendations are grouped as one item because they relate, in the main, to improved computer services. With the planned expansion of District computer capability, the Council believes that on-line registration and better management information should be the planning priorities for the computer or data processing department of the District.

PART II. EXTENDED PROCESSES AND ACTIVITIES

A. Educational Planning

Direction for Educational Planning

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that a District Educational Master Plan be developed. The development of the Educational Master Plan should continue as an ongoing and intensified process. Individual College Plans should be developed and incorporated as part of the District Educational Master Plan. The College Plans should include the following components:

(1) General Academic Plan
(2) Occupational and Vocational Plan
(3) Developmental Education Plan
(4) Educational Support Services Plan
(5) Institutional Support Services Plan
(6) Staffing Plan

Planning Outcomes

The advantages of long-range planning are abundantly cited in the literature on the subject, but to amplify the necessity for this activity, some of the beneficial results are: (Parekh, S.B., 1975)

1. Long-range planning provides a commonality of understanding about the mission and goals of the institution and the strategies to implement them.

2. It summarizes the profile for the institution in quantitative terms.

3. It encourages better allocation and utilization of resources.

4. It helps direct energies away from the nonessential to the essential activities.

5. It makes evaluation possible in objective terms simultaneously with implementation.

6. It assists in generating funds by strengthening the institutional case with granting agencies, governmental and corporate.

7. It helps ensure survival and growth of the institution.

B. Facilities Planning and Development

Priorities for Facilities Planning

The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that facilities planning and development be continued by:

(1) Updating the existing College Facility Master Plan and initiating the facility plan for South Mountain Community College.

(2) Completing the colleges' facilities in accordance with the updated Plan.

(3) Selecting and securing sites for the new colleges.

PART III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Introduction

Review of Council's Work

The purpose of this section of the report is to review the charge given to the Joint Council on Educational Priorities in the "Chancellor's Blueprint for Long-Range Educational Planning" and to point out the "unfinished business".

B. First Set of Planning Questions (Page 3, "Chancellor's Blueprint", January 1978)

Question	*Action Taken*
1. How many additional sites for either center or full-campus development should be acquired by MCCCD to take us through the next decade or 1990, which is only twelve years away?	1. *See Long-Range Master Plan for MCCCD 1978-2000 prepared by Tadlock Associates.*
a. Based on population, demographic and transportation patterns, where should these sites be located?	
2. Should a nontraditional community college, primarily focusing on outreach and alternative delivery systems be developed as an interim step?	2. *Question answered by creation of Rio Salado Community College.*
3. Should capital expansion be "capped" on existing colleges where the growth potential is either low or nonexistent?	3. *See Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommendation, this report, PART II, topic B(2).*
4. Should the District proceed with an Allied Health Center?	4. *Discussion only by JCEP; referred to "Ad Hoc Committee to Study Tadlock Report".*
5. Assuming Phoenix College could coordinate an Allied Health Center, should the District seek an additional site or should it be incorporated into existing facilities at either Phoenix College or Maricopa Technical Community College, accompanying transferring, and exchanging of programs to accommodate the new Allied Health Center?	5. *Discussion only by JCEP; referred to "Ad Hoc Committee to Study Tadlock Report".*
6. In view of the success of the Maricopa County Skill Center, should an additional skill center be planned?	6. *The Joint Council on Educational Priorities recommends that Rio Salado Community College should respond to this question.*
7. Should Maricopa Technical Community College continue to expand or should it be "capped" off with the Seventh Avenue Center, the Downtown Center, and the East Washington Street Center?	7. *Discussion only by JCEP; referred to "Ad Hoc Committee to Study Tadlock Report".*

C. Second Set of Planning Questions (Pages 4 and 5, "Chancellor's Blueprint", January 1978)

Question	*Action Taken*
1. What are the forecasts for future economic and industrial development of Maricopa County?	1. *Question will be answered in the process of educational planning activities by the District and colleges.*
a. What new industries are planned for the future of this County?	
b. What effect will EPS regulations and supply of water have on future expansion?	
2. What are the needs of emerging groups in the Maricopa County Community College District?	2. *See JCEP recommendation, this report, PART I, topics D and E.*
a. Who are the unserved clientele?	
b. Who is in need of our services and has not been served?	
c. Who are the target populations or the clientele that we serve over the next five years?	
3. Who are already on our existing campuses that are not properly served?	3. *Answered, in part, by JCEP recommendation, this report, PART I, topic B.*
a. What special services do women, handicapped, disadvantaged, and the older student require that are not now currently being provided?	
4. What are the manpower needs anticipated by representative business, industrial, labor, public agency, and health human service organizations?	4. *Question will be answered in the process of educational planning activities by the District and colleges.*
a. What are program priorities for the Maricopa County Community College District, based on this assessment?	

5. What are the special and employment needs in technical, paraprofessional, and service occupations that arise from the differentiation of levels of training and competence in the world of work?	5. *See JCEP recommendation, this report, PART I, topic A.*
6. What are the basic societal shift trends and conditions that need to be addressed programmatically, such as changing women's roles, increases in alcohol and drug abuse, needs of the elderly, health care policies and local needs, prison reform, etc., etc.	6. *The question points to information needed for program development and will be answered by the Office of Analytical Studies and those involved in college and District educational planning.*
7. What are the special support services necessary to make instruction and learning effective for newer clientele for the community college, such as the handicapped, the elderly, the economically and socially disadvantaged?	7. *The question points to information needed for program development and will be answered by the Office of Analytical Studies and those involved in college and District educational planning.*
8. What are the most effective educational delivery systems not currently utilized in the Maricopa County Community College District? How can they be tested, supported when effective, and withdrawn when not useful?	8. *Answer follows from JCEP recommendation, this report, PART I, topic F.*
9. What special problems should be addressed, such as the colleges' retention rate; the need for basic skills development in computation, writing, and reading; overt recruitment of students?	9. *See JCEP recommendations, this report, PART I, topics B, C, and D.*
10. How can effective educational programming for present and educationally deprived students be implemented so that the District avoids recruiting students into the colleges only to have them fail after they have been admitted?	10. *See JCEP recommendations, this report, PART I and PART II.*

REFERENCES

Harlacher, Ervin I., and Gottallscheck, James F. (Ed.). New Directions for Community Colleges: Implementing Community-Based Education, no. 21. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1978. (See Tadlock, Max. "Planning: How to Get There", p.7.)

Parekh, Satish, B. Long-Range Planning: An Institution-Wide Approach to Increasing Academic Vitality. Change Magazine Press, New Rochelle, New York, 1975.

Roueche, John E. and Roueche, Suanne D. Developmental Education: A Primer for Program Development and Evaluation. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, 1977.

Tadlock Associates, Inc. Long-Range Master Plan for Maricopa County Community College District 1978-2000. A report prepared for the Maricopa County Community College District, May 1978.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 2 3 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES